

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

VOLUME VIII

FEBRUARY 1913

NUMBER 5

Editorial

MEETINGS OF THE AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION AND THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE OF AMERICA

The forty-second annual meeting of the American Philological Association was held in Washington, D.C., December 26-30, in connection with the meetings of the Archaeological Institute of America and the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis. The lower floor of the beautiful new building of the National Museum, Smithsonian Institution, was placed at the disposal of the societies, and every provision was made for the personal convenience of members. It was unfortunate, however, that the rooms provided for the sectional meetings were in many instances too small, and the rooms so situated that the reading of papers and the discussions were seriously interrupted by the steady volume of sound coming in from the public corridors. A quiet college building, with ample lecture rooms, well lighted and ventilated, is after all more to be desired for such a gathering than the more splendid public building.

Two joint sessions were held: the first, on Friday evening, was given to the presidential address of the Philological Association, a discriminating paper by Professor Thomas Dwight Goodell of Yale University on "An Athenian Critic of Life." The work of Sophocles was finely set forth in its broad human relations. On Saturday afternoon a program of common interest to all the sections ranged from pictures showing German excavations in Baalbek and the latest American work at Vrokastro in Crete to a spicy discussion of the question, "What is the matter with our American scholarship?" by a Canadian delegate. The last-named paper,

by its appreciative mention of the name of Professor Gildersleeve, whose presence that afternoon was a joy to the whole audience, gave occasion for prolonged applause in honor of the foremost American classical scholar. Unfortunately the same paper was at a later stage marred by personal political allusions that were in unpardonably bad taste at such a time and place.

The papers read before the Philological Association at its own sessions covered the usual broad range of topics, textual, linguistic, and literary. There were perhaps more papers than usual of interest beyond the narrower circle of specialists; some, notably one by Professor Van Hook of Columbia, were of fine literary character, both in form and content. A paper by Professor Hale of Chicago on "The Classification of Sentences and Clauses" introduced a report of progress by the joint committee of the Philological Association and the Modern Language Association on the Harmonizing of Grammatical Terminology. This committee is devoting a great deal of time to its work, and on December 28 began a week's session in Philadelphia. It is hoped that at least a preliminary report will be ready for discussion in the December meeting of 1913.

Many of the papers of the Institute were presented in sectional meetings, the sectional divisions being Oriental, Mediaeval and Renaissance, and Prehistoric and American. It was pleasant and appropriate that the Biblical Society met this year with the others, closely allied as it is both on the linguistic and the archaeological sides of its activity.

The scholarly and well-balanced papers by many of the younger men were a most encouraging feature of all the meetings. Resolutions appreciative of the life work of Professor William Watson Goodwin were a reminder that the old masters are passing on; not a few of the papers at this meeting were by pupils of pupils of Seymour and Goodwin.

The Philological Association expressed itself as in favor of some arrangement by which, as suggested by the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, it may come into immediate connection with the members of that body at the next meeting of the Philological Association. By a general understanding, that

meeting will be in 1914. The Association voted to recommend to a special committee that the meeting of 1913 be arranged, if practicable, in connection with the meeting of the Modern Language Association. It is likely that the meeting will be in Cambridge. That would give opportunity for joint discussion of the report of the Committee on Harmonizing Grammatical Terminology, and would bring the representatives of the ancient and the modern languages into the more active co-operation that is natural and desirable. The Philological Association seems inclined to vary its affiliations from time to time; the meetings with the Archaeological Institute have obvious advantages, and will certainly not be abandoned, but it is likely that in some years the Association will meet by itself, and in other years with some of the other societies.

Generous hospitality was shown the members attending the meetings by the Washington institutions. A delightful feature of one session was the participation of Ambassador Brice in a discussion, where, in the most modest way, he spoke on Greek and Roman oratory with a definiteness of knowledge that one is accustomed to expect only in the professional scholar with us. Again at an evening reception in the Pan-American Building given by the Washington Society of the Archaeological Institute, Mr. Brice spoke most happily and appreciatively of classical studies.

The President of the Philological Association for the coming year is Professor Harold North Fowler of Western Reserve University; of the Archaeological Institute, Professor Harry Langford Wilson of Johns Hopkins.

The Council of the Institute took action looking toward transforming the *Bulletin* into a monthly non-technical journal. The Council also approved a plan leading toward the establishment of a school of archaeology in China. A committee will make a preliminary survey of the field and report to the Council in 1914. It was also voted to establish a Committee on Museums, which will help those who are establishing or developing museums throughout the country.

C. D. A.

CICERO THE STYLIST: AN APPRECIATION¹

BY GRANT SHOWERMAN
The University of Wisconsin

The tendency to underestimate Cicero is not a phenomenon of our own generation alone. Among the critics of Roman times, as well as among the critics of today, there have been those who have felt in him too little of substance and heat, too much of verbal exuberance.

Without the least desire to ignore or to distract attention from the real defects of the style of Cicero, I wish to present one or two reasons why we should not allow ourselves to be swept from our feet by these criticisms, which, because of their assemblage and emphasis in certain manuals much venerated, and with good right, by students of Roman literature, have come to be of the nature of a fashion—too much so for the comfort of either the lover of Cicero or the lover of justice. And yet, my purpose is not so much to render unto the orator the things that are his—for this has already been done with great thoroughness more than once, and recently—as to restore, or preserve, or beget the proper balance of mind in those students or teachers of Cicero whose faith may have been impaired, or in whom faith has not yet really been born.

Conceding, first of all, with Cicero's greatest admirer in antiquity, that we are not to look for perfection in any man,² let us examine into the nature of Ciceronian style. This will bring directly to our attention both the virtues which are claimed

¹Read before the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, Cincinnati, April, 1912.

²Quint. x. 1. 24: Neque id statim legenti persuasum sit, omnia quae optimi auctores dixerint utique esse perfecta. Nam et labuntur aliquando et oneri cedunt, et indulgent ingeniorum suorum voluptati, nec semper intendunt animum, nonnumquam fatigantur; cum Ciceroni dormire interim Demosthenes, Horatio vero etiam Homerus ipse videatur. Cf. xii. 1. 22: . . . nec Cicero Bruto Calvoque, qui certe compositionem illius etiam apud ipsum reprehendunt.

for it and the vices which are charged against it. It will also demonstrate—what is of great moment in the formation of a final estimate—that the vices and virtues of Ciceronianism are often identical, and that mere prejudice, or slight variation of temperament in the critic, may serve to render the virtue into a vice, or to make of the vice a virtue.

Our inquiry must really be, then, as to whether the charges against Ciceronianism are valid in the greater degree, or only in the less.

Perhaps it will conduce to an easier grasp of the nature of Cicero's art if I select what seems to me the quality which embraces most of its virtues, and about it as a center construct my appreciation.

This quality is simply a marvelous fluency. Whether in oration, essay, or formal epistle, Ciceronian eloquence is a full-flowing, unceasing current. It streams—smoothly, steadily, reposefully.

By fluency, too, I mean not only fluency of language, but fluency of thought. There is fluent thinking, as well as fluent writing or speaking. There is thinking which streams easily and continuously, and there is thinking which leaps, or halts, or strays and loses time in getting back again, or never gets back. Cicero's thought is copious, continuous, logical. His mental processes are easy-running. There are no breaks, no jolts; there is no getting lost. When we are led aside from the main path, it is with full consciousness that the path is still there, and that we are soon to return to it.

Now the virtue of fluent thought is that it is clear and easily followed. Further, that which is clear and easily followed is not always duly credited with depth. Cicero has not escaped the charge of superficiality. Is the charge well founded?

When we think of the philosophical essays, of the many rich *loci communes* imbedded in the orations, or of the compression of Plato's whole doctrine of the immortality of the soul into a few lines of *De Senectute*, we are not disposed to facile acceptance of this criticism. However, even granted that Cicero's thought does seem to lie on the surface, we may ask, in turn, What constitutes depth? Anyone may easily call to mind, for example, thinkers

in the religious life of the past century who seemed to the onlooker of their day to drop their plummets down the broad, deep universe, and find no bottom; yet their doctrines are clear enough now, and the expressions of the average religious journal of today make them appear even conservative. We have adopted their thought and are familiar with it. The preacher who should deliver the content of their sermons today would arouse no excitement, and would probably be called platitudinous. And besides, there is often a confusion of depth of thought with thought only partially expressed. Omit to express a link here and there in the logical process, and it is conceivable that the reader will think you are deep, when, as a matter of fact, you are only careless, lazy, or stupid. The deepest thought is but the final link in a long, logical chain. Take time, let every successive link be traced, and a natural and easy progress brings you to the end—granting, of course, the possession of the experience necessary to comprehension.

But this brings us back to language. Ciceronian fluency of thought finds a perfect medium of expression in Ciceronian fluency of language. The full, streaming, logical process is clothed in full, streaming, verbal dress. All is clearness, limpidity, ease. *Ce qui n'est pas éclair, n'est pas de Cicéron*. Few writers so effectively conserve the energy of the reader by leading him gently and noiselessly and effortlessly from the beginning to the end of his thought. There are no haltings, no leaps and jerks, no lacunae or ellipses. All is amplitude and fulness. Cicero does not scruple to use all the words he needs. The epigrammatic comparison of him with Demosthenes by Quintilian is more reliable than most epigrams. "From the one you can take nothing away, to the other you can add nothing."¹

As might be expected, such fulness invites the charge of redundancy. Let us examine this charge also.

It may, indeed, be conceded that many a word could be omitted from Cicero's orations without very appreciably interfering with the sense. The orator's delight in fulness leads him to employ pairs of words and phrases where the second member balances the first, and often seems merely to repeat it. In most cases,

¹ *Inst. Or.* x. 1. 106.

however, a little examination will show that expressions which are apparently synonymous are not so in reality. Cicero's method here is not repetition, but amplification, and the result is a sense of richness and abundance of resource. Such phrases as the following are not examples of tautology: *caste integreque; singulari eximiaque virtute; bellum grave et periculosum; animos excitare atque inflammare; laboribus et periculis; clari et magni; qui aut videbunt vestrum monumentum aut audient; sententiis nostris consultiisque; maerorem atque luctum*.¹ The repetition of idea is only partial. The risk of redundancy is worth running for the sake of the harmony of the language and the sense of equipoise in the thought. Pairs like this may be compared to two circles which slightly intersect each other; there is common ground, but the areas are by no means identical. They are, indeed, often entirely separate, but there is always a balance of thought and sound.

So also when Cicero employs a series of words—*consilio, auctoritate, sententia; credulos, obliviosos, dissolutos; mente, ratione, cogitatione; inconstantia, levitate, mobilitate*. We might, to be sure, omit some of these terms and not fail to be understood. Sometimes, it may be conceded, we should be glad to omit; but not often, and then, perhaps, not wisely—for the question of harmony and rhythm is also to be considered, and sentiment. Think, for example, of the rich vowel and consonantal harmonies, of the rhythmical quality, and of the fitness of language to content in the following sentence: *Horae quidem cedunt et dies et menses et anni, nec praeteritum tempus umquam revertitur, nec quid sequatur sciri potest*. To the simple-primrose kind of people, it would have been perhaps just as satisfying had Cicero merely said: *tempus fugit et numquam revertitur*; yet how lame and unconvincing an expression of the sense of long-continued passage of time and the impossibility of its recall as compared with the elegant, ample, and reposeful sentence of the stylist.

When there occurs actual repetition of words, there is, of course, no question of tautology, for this is one of the ordinary factors in

¹ These examples and some of those which follow were collected by Miss Frances W. Durbrow, University of Wisconsin, 1910, and used in her excellent Bachelor's thesis on *The Style of Cicero*.

rhetorical art. *Unum sentitis omnes, unum studetis. . . . Quem umquam iste ordo patronum adoptavit? Si quemquam, debuit me. Sed me omitto. Quem censorem? Quem imperatorem?* No apology is necessary for this kind of repetition.

But the most effective of all of Cicero's devices for fluency is to be seen in his use of the connective. "In literature," says Balzac, "the art lies entirely in the gracefulness of the transitions." This is exaggeration, of course, but it contains a great principle of style. Cicero is master of the art of graceful transition. Nothing can be more admirable than the skill and ease with which one sentence is made to follow another. All the fine variety of Latin conjunctions and relative pronouns and adverbs is pressed into service with unequaled dexterity. Almost any page of any work shows it. *Enim, quamquam, enim, et tamen, quarum, autem, enim, etsi, sed, quidem, igitur, sed, autem, apud quem, qui si, sed, enim*, is the array that makes the first paragraphs of *De Senectute* flow; some of them adversative, some continuative, some relative, some stronger, and some weaker, and all serving to gather up and present in review before the mind, so to speak, the contents of the sentence or clause immediately preceding before going on to the next. Examine the following paragraph. What a wealth of words, what easy connection, and what fluency and fulness as a result! About one word in five is not strictly necessary, yet not a word in the passage is actually superfluous.

(Hoc) *enim* onere, quod mihi (commune) tecum est, (aut iam) urgentis aut (certe) adventantis senectutis (et) te et me (etiam ipsum) levari volo; *etsi* te (*quidem*) id (modice et) sapienter (sic) ut omnia (et) ferre et laturum esse (certo) scio. *Sed* (mihi), cum de senectute vellem aliquid scribere, (tu) occurrebas dignus (eo) munere quo uterque (nostrum communiter) uteretur. Mihi (*quidem*) ita iucunda (huius) libri confectio fuit, ut non modo (omnes) absterserit senectutis molestias, sed effecerit (mollem etiam et) iucundam senectutem. Numquam *igitur* (digne) satis laudari philosophia poterit, *cui* qui pareat omne tempus aetatis sine molestia possit degere.¹

The continuity and fulness of Cicero's language are second only to the continuity and fulness of his thought.

Again, Cicero's language is not only full and fluent, but painstaking and pure. Language is, after all, so imperfect a medium,

¹ *De Senec.* 2. The italics indicate connection, and the parentheses inclose words not strictly necessary.

and so dependent for efficiency upon the attention and experience of the auditor and reader, that the loss of thought in greater or less measure during transit is inevitable. Yet the loss may be reduced to a negligible amount, and in Cicero it is so reduced. His language conveys to us what he thinks—not more, and not less.

There are great differences possible in this respect. Most writers of our own day, and perhaps most writers of antiquity—certainly most writers of today, and most speakers—appear to be content with the use of such language as will enable the reader or listener to understand if he brings good-will to the task. The crying literary sin of the generation is looseness and mediocrity—excused and encouraged by manuals of English which seem to justify any usage if it is only susceptible of psychological explanation, by dictionaries which permit spelling according to the taste of the individual, by reform boards which refuse all authority to tradition, by a press which is in constant feverish hurry and whose sole refinement is in the direction of piquancy, by successful so-called literary men who have gone far toward drowning literature and the taste for literature in a flood of journalism, by a public sentiment which resents any mode of expression superior to its own, by an educational system which permits the employment of illiterates to expound its theories, to superintend its teachers, and to give instruction in its schools.

There is a vast difference between language which allows you to understand and language which compels you to understand, whether you will or not; yet the conception of this difference may be said practically not to exist. I heard a modern novelist of some fame state in a public lecture that he regarded form and style as not half so important as content. This is, of course, not meant to be an exhortation to looseness, but it has that practical effect. Why should a college student be inspired to strive for refinement of style when a financially successful literary man attaches slight importance to it? No wonder our undergraduates are surprised and indignant when we point out to them that what they really have written is not necessarily what they think they have written.

This fulness and fluency and absolute perspicuity in Cicero

must share with his clear and fluent logical processes something of the responsibility of having invited the charge of superficiality. But here again we must be on our guard. Almost any thought which is poorly expressed is obscure, and obscurity, in that it does not yield to vision, shares to some extent the character of depth. You may look into a certain river-source in Florida that is sixty feet deep and see bottom with utter distinctness; and again, you may look almost any day into a puddle only three inches deep whose bottom is utterly indistinguishable. It all depends upon the medium. Many a writer has a reputation for depth who is only muddy—intellectually, stylistically, or both. There is probably not a person in this presence who does not stand in awe of a German presentation more than of an English, French or an Italian presentation, though it may contain only the same knowledge, or even less. I myself plead guilty to an instinctive tendency to bow down before a German note—in some sort, at least, a melancholy survival of the days when I spent so many virtuous hours interpreting German commentaries by the aid of the Greek and Latin texts they were meant to illuminate.

But fulness of thought and language and gracefulness of transition are not the only qualities which make for fluency. Words are chosen by the stylist not for their meaning alone, but for the charm of their vowel and consonantal qualities, and for their rhythmical composition. The modern ear is more or less unappreciative of the magic of harmonious sound in prose—at least, it is not often consciously appreciative, but euphony is, nevertheless, a factor which is to be taken into account.

There is even yet, once in a while, a stylist who is conscious of the spell of harmonious and rhythmical diction. Let us listen to one or two of them.

One of them is an Englishman.

Each phrase of each sentence, [says Robert Louis Stevenson¹] like an air or recitative in music, should be so artfully compounded out of long and short, out of accented and unaccented, as to gratify the sensual ear. And of this the ear is the sole judge. It is impossible to lay down laws. . . . Each phrase in literature is built of sounds, as each phrase in music consists of notes.

¹ *Contemp. Rev.*, 1885.

One sound suggests, echoes, demands, and harmonizes with another; and the art of rightly using these concordances is the final art of literature. . . . We begin to see now what an intricate affair is any perfect passage; how many faculties, whether of taste or pure reason, must be held upon the stretch to make it; and why, when it is made, it should afford so complete a pleasure.

The other is a Spaniard.

Here comes a period [says Valdés of prose style, in *Semblanzas Literarias*¹], ample, polished, and sonorous, of the kind that the pseudo-classicist is always seeking without knowing what he is after; after that, another, short and palpitating as the heart that dictates it. Here appears one, gentle and honeyed, like the love-making compliment of a youth, and then, at full speed there rises after it another, dry and harsh, that cuts it short. Prose, in a word, hates monotony like death, and takes pains to demonstrate the fact on every possible occasion. Perhaps this is why it rarely rises to the sky. The sky is charming, but it is monotonous. . . . Prose, too, is not absolutely without rhythm. Its rhythm is much more deep and mystical than that of metrical language, but, for all that, it is not without existence. A delicate ear perceives it as the bland and hidden music from within a dark forest. Who would venture to deny rhythm, number, and harmony to the prose of Cervantes, Fénelon, or Manzoni? I would not be the one to assume such responsibility. The fact is, that the rhythm of prose is not uniform and continuous like that of verse. The winds of thought agitate it at their caprice, and cause it to vary its direction at every instant, without ever allowing it a point of repose. Prose, better than verse, obeys the insinuations of the spirit, obediently allowing itself like a feather, to be raised, sometimes to regions serene and tranquil, and again to be wafted through places intricate and obscure.

It is not ours to realize in all fulness the harmonies of a language which has ceased to be a living medium of expression. That they were there, and that they were assiduously and lovingly cultivated, there is no doubt. We know it from Cicero's own references to choice of words, and, still more, from his employment of ample and sonorous expression.

Who has failed to be struck with the abundance of superlatives in the orations?

Vestram virtutem, iustitiam, fidem, mihi credite, is maxime probabit, qui in iudicibus legendis optimum et sapientissimum et fortissimum quemque elegit.²

. . . . Omnis exterarum gentium potentissimorumque populorum, omnis clarissimorum regum res gestas cum tuis nec contentionum magnitudine nec numero proeliorum nec varietate regionum nec celeritate conficiendi nec

¹ Pp. 380, 382.

² *Pro. Mil.*, 105.

dissimilitudine bellorum posse conferri, nec vero disiunctissimas terras citius passibus cuiusquam potuisse peragrari, etc.¹

The superlative is resonant as well as emphatic, and its frequency is probably due as much to the former quality as to the latter.

The gerund and gerundive constructions, too—with what evident fondness the orator employs them, for the same reason:

Omnia sunt excitanda tibi, C. Caesar, uni, quae iacere sentis, belli ipsius impetu, quod necesse fuit, perculsa atque prostrata: constituenda iudicia, revocanda fides, comprimendae libidines, propaganda suboles, omnia quae dilapsa iam diffluerunt, severis legibus vincienda sunt.²

Nisi P. Servilio, clarissimo viro, respondendum putarem, qui hunc honorem statuae nemini tribuendum censuit nisi ei qui ferro esset in legatione interfectus: ego autem, patres conscripti, sic interpretor sensisse maiores nostros, ut causam mortis censuerint, non genus esse quaerendum.³

But there is another harmony than that of the sonorous word. There is rhythm. In spite of Zielinski, Laurand, and others, I am not yet convinced that a prose rhythm susceptible of analysis occurs in Cicero; but this much is certain: that his ear was sensitive to the rhythm of sentence-endings, and that he was conscious of the art of rhythm, and—in part consciously, in part unconsciously—used it. When he finds fault with Demosthenes, who for him excels in every kind of eloquence, it is in terms which strongly suggest how his judgment of oratory is based in great part on its appeal to the ear: *qui quamquam unus eminet omnes in omni genere dicendi, tamen non semper implet auris meas; ita avidae et capaces et semper aliquid immensum infinitumque desiderant.*⁴ It is not improbable that a study of the style of our best modern speakers and writers would reveal the same sensitiveness of ear, and even the same avoidance of certain unrhythmical combinations—though in a less degree; for the conscious element in Cicero is large.

For, in spite of the natural gift which is manifest on every page, we must not think of Cicero as unstudied. I once heard Ignatius Donnelly say that there was a difference between the handwriting

¹ *Pro Marcell.*, 5.

Phil. ix, 3.

² *Ibid.*, 23.

⁴ *Or.* 104.

of the man who was used to the pen and that of the man who wrote with his tongue out. What he said of handwriting may be said also of style. No one is farther than Cicero from the appearance of being labored. We naturally think of his work as effortless. Yet some of the best prose in the world has been the product of as much pains as verse itself, and prose successes have been hardly more frequent than successes in poetry. Pitfalls beset the ready writer.

You write with ease to show your breeding,
But easy writing 's curst hard reading,

wrote Sheridan. When we remember the severe training to which Cicero subjected himself, the translation and retranslation of Greek and Latin authors during his practice in composition and declamation; his emphatic assertion that the stilus is the *effector ac magister dicendi*; the fact that the style of his letters ranges from the conversational to the polite and literary—we shall not be too quick to conclude that Cicero wrote without effort. However great his instinct for language, writing and speaking were with him an art. He would have agreed with Horace that talent and cultivation should go hand in hand, just as he agrees with Horace that wisdom is the source of all good writing—*dicendi facultatem ex intimis sapientiae fontibus fluere*.¹

The essential characteristic of Ciceronianism, then, is fluency—fluency of mental process, and fluency of expression secured by fulness of vocabulary, grace of transition, sonorous sound, and rhythmical movement. The style of Cicero is an easily gliding stream, calm and noiseless, but sweeping and powerful.

Easily gliding streams might be monotonous, however. The Ciceronian stream is not. Here and there the smooth and sweeping current narrows and deepens, and surges between the rocks in the noisy rapids of the passionate invective or the still more passionate appeal to patriotism. Here, it expands again into the broad and placid pools of the *loci communes*. Here, the surface breaks in the ripples of vivacity and wit. Even its broadest reaches are dimpled with the eddies of variety. It is neither

¹ Quint. xii. 2. 6: Hinc etiam illud est, quod Cicero pluribus et libris et epistolis testatur, dicendi facultatem ex intimis sapientiae fontibus fluere.

Asian nor Attic, but each in turn, and both together—or, rather, neither of them; for perfect oratory belongs consistently to itself. Cicero's oratory, like his philosophy, is eclectic. His style belongs to no school; it represents the selection and assimilation of the best qualities in both schools by a nature well tuned to the harmonies of thought and sound. As the philosophy which he formed for himself out of his wide study of the Greek systems was an individual philosophy of action, so the result of his patient study of Greek oratory was a living product belonging all to himself. He is a Phidias or a Raphael of style—facile, abundant, inspired; not without fault, but summing up the excellences of the times that begot him.

The fact is that neither in ancient nor in modern times have the fountains been wholly pure from which the words of Cicero's adverse critics flow.

The motives of the ancient critic may be estimated from what is told us by Quintilian and Tacitus. The former says, referring to Cicero:

Whom, nevertheless, men of his own time dared to assail with the charge of being tumid, Asiatic, redundant, too fond of repetition, sometimes frigid in his wit, and in composition scrappy, jingling, and—far be it from the truth—almost too soft for real vigor. . . . Especially did those press upon him who were eager to seem imitators of the Attic orators. This clique, as though initiated into certain religious mysteries, assailed him as an alien-born, so to speak, who would not bow down in awe before their precepts, and refused to be bound by them.¹

Again, in the *Dialogus*, of the same generation and by a pupil of Quintilian, we read:

Of course you have read the letters of Calvus and Brutus to Cicero. From them it is easy to understand that to Cicero, Calvus seemed bloodless and arid, and to Brutus leisurely and disjointed; and, in turn, that Calvus gave Cicero a bad name for being loose and sinewless, and that Brutus, to use his own words, charged him with being, so to speak, broken and limping.²

The criticisms of Fronto and the *Elocutio Novella* enthusiasts, who, with a freakish desire for originality, and with freakish devotion to a freakish theory of style, sought the golden days of

¹ Quint. xii. 10. 12-14.

² Tac. *Dial.* 18.

style in the time long before Cicero, we may pass over without comment.¹

It is plain, of course, that this ancient criticism is, for the most part, the detraction of the Atticists, and that they are employing the stock objections of the Atticists to Asianism. With the narrow partisanship of the school, they take no account of the fact that Cicero is no mere Asiatic, but an eclectic whose style is compounded of the best elements of more than one school, and invest him with all of the faults with which their enemy, Asianism, is commonly charged. Just how much of their criticism is due to rhetorical allegiance, and how much to actual and sincere taste, we may not measure. Both were there; but we may sum up their attitude thus: they *would* not sympathize with the Ciceronian ideal, and they *could* not.

With modern criticism the case is somewhat different. It is not wholly without significance that those who lead in the condemnation of both Ciceronian style and content belong to a nation which has achieved an unenviable reputation for the laborious use of language and the obscure presentation of the results both of learning and speculation, and that Cicero's most eloquent defenders, aside from the author of *Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte*, are French and Italian.

But it is not only the Teuton who lifts his voice against Cicero, or gladly hears his critics. We have not only an ethnological factor in the disparagement of Ciceronianism, but a chronological factor. The modern finds it somewhat easier to criticize Cicero for the reason that our times attribute less importance than the ancients to the spoken word, and even to the written word. Even the Frenchman sympathizes with the spirit of an age which, through long suffering from the abuse of words, has come to despise the art of speech, and is impatient with the mere idea of it. Said Fénelon: "L'homme digne d'être écouté est celui qui ne se sert de la parole que pour la pensée."² The very names of rhetoric, oratory, elocution, and declamation are in bad repute. Our college courses now are in "English" and "public speaking" instead of in rhetoric

¹ Schanz, *Rom. Lit.*, III, 102.

² *Lettre à l'Académie*, chap. 4.

and elocution, just as pedagogy has sought new respectability under the guise of "education."

That the reaction against the rhetorical has elements of health, of course no one would think of denying. It is equally clear, however, that the modern ear is dull to the art of the spoken word, and that the modern tongue disparages an art to which it cannot attain.

And now we may complete our epigram, remembering, of course, the reputation of the epigram for general unwillingness to spoil good sentences for the sake of the truth: the ancient critic *would* not, and *could* not, sympathize with the Ciceronian ideal; the modern critic *cannot*, and *will not*.

To conclude: whether we are enthusiastic admirers of Cicero or not is in part a matter of temperament, and in part a matter of real and familiar acquaintance with him—and, though I have been considering only Cicero the stylist, the same may be said of the man. If we are possessed of a strong sense of art, we shall see in him one of the world's few masters of the written and spoken word. If we are of plain, matter-of-fact, brachycephalic temperament, we shall probably not rise to the heights of greatest enthusiasm over his work, or that of any other orator or essayist whose eloquence depends largely upon style; but we should in that case move cautiously, giving heed to Quintilian's sensible admonition: "In pronouncing judgment on great men like these, we should be modest and circumspect, lest we condemn what we do not understand—a thing which often happens."¹

¹ x. 1. 26: Modesto tamen et circumspecto iudicio de tantis viris pronuntiandum est, ne, quod plerisque accidit, damnent quae non intellegunt.

THE TRAGEDY OF DIDO

PART II

BY HERBERT H. YEAMES
Hobart College, Geneva, N.Y.

Dido is, therefore, let us repeat, not so much an example, like Medea and Phaedra, that "hell hath no fury like a woman scorned," as an example of the remorse and madness that come from the failure of character, from the consciousness of pride humiliated by the lowering of ideals, by faithlessness to duty. Hers is a tragedy, not so much of love betrayed and deserted, as of love turned to hate when it conflicts with duty; love, therefore, that is not real love but fierce passion, a disease and a madness, conceiving sin and bringing forth death. It is because the drama is portrayed wholly from Dido's point of view that we misinterpret it as we do; Virgil's genius in drawing his heroine so sympathetically that every reader sympathizes with her, too, ought not to mislead us; but the fact is that nine out of every ten critics are misled.¹ Even Conington could say of Virgil's "spirit of dramatic fair dealing toward his hero's enemies" that it is "an error in judgment."²

There is a striking parallel in the case of the *Prometheus* of Aeschylus. Because we possess only one play of the trilogy, the one in which the point of view is wholly that of the hero, we sympathize so much with Prometheus that he has come to be the very symbol of oppressed humanity, unconquerable in its defiance of injustice, the type of the afflicted benefactor of mankind. This view, immortalized by Shelley in his *Prometheus Unbound*, is none the less a mistake, as the recovery of the *Prometheus Unbound*, of Aeschylus would undoubtedly prove. We are meant to sympathize with the protagonist, even as the chorus does—though not without

¹ I need not say that my mention, in another paper, of "the tremendous curse pronounced by Dido upon the recreant Aeneas"—which Professor Lodge so triumphantly seizes upon—was made with entire dramatic propriety: the point of view, for the moment, is that of Dido! See "On Teaching Virgil," *School Review*, Jan. 1912.

² P. 28 of the Introduction to his commentary.

suggestive hints at the poet's own view—and all the dramatic power of the poet is bent on making his hero appeal to the emotions of pity and terror. So successful is the artist that we forget that to him Zeus is, after all, the embodiment of the highest moral law, a power that makes for righteousness, preached elsewhere in his dramas with a sublimity that only the Hebrew prophets have surpassed. With all his nobility, Prometheus is diseased with pride, which drives him into defiant rebellion;¹ he is therefore a true tragic hero, as he could not be (according to Aristotle) if he were faultlessly good, the victim of wrong and injustice: such a tragic spectacle would jar upon the artistic as well as the moral sense. Throughout the drama Zeus seems to play a sorry part, merely because we see him only through the eyes of Prometheus and his sympathizers.

So in the tragedy of *Dido* Aeneas seems to play a sorry part, and we leave it (most of us) with a sense of moral revolt and a protest against Virgil's artistic feeling or skill. Certainly it is we who are wrong, and not Aeschylus and Virgil. If we would trust our poets, whose very dramatic power shows that they have sympathies quite as deep as ours, and whose insight is far beyond that of us prosaic critics, we should know that they are still great teachers of all that is high, and that the moral law is quite safe in their hands. Of course, even a "universal" poet is conditioned by his time and his environment, just as the critics are, but his genius is able to transcend his limits and gain an insight into the heart of things, to grasp something of the eternal and express it so that it becomes the eternal possession of all mankind; able even to perform the miracle of pouring new wine into old bottles, in so far as he makes use of the traditional forms and inherited conventions as a vehicle for the conveyance of new truths.

Virgil is dealing with the same problems that occupied Aeschylus and Euripides, and dealing with them in ways that are in part an inheritance from his literary predecessors; but he has added a new element toward their solution, something that neither the faith of Aeschylus nor the doubt of Euripides quite achieved. In fact, he

¹ It is well known that Milton drew from him no small part of his own Titanic character, the fallen rebel, Satan.

has gone so far toward the Christian solution of these problems that he has been instinctively claimed as a Christian by many a reader. The tragic conflict of good and evil remains and will remain upon earth, but Virgil was feeling his way beyond the speculations of his predecessors to a new principle of reconciliation, and that principle is love—for what else is the Virgilian *pietas* but love combined with devotion to duty?

He chooses a hero who represents an entirely new type of manhood, *insignem pietate virum*,¹ a type which has generally been misunderstood, and which even after centuries of Christianity we are not yet apt to appreciate—witness the difficulty we have in understanding or explaining or translating the epithet *pius*. He attempts to represent in Aeneas the type of manhood that had made Rome what it was, with the addition of qualities that would make Rome what it should be. If there is any failure in his attempt—and perfect success can hardly be looked for in the effort to picture a character who should be at the same time ideal and humanly real—it is due to the sensitive (Professor Lodge would call it “feminine”) nature of the shy poet, who could not paint an altogether convincing portrait of an efficient man of affairs and would not portray a mighty man of war—what use for mere warriors or mere statesmen had the empire of his ideal? But some of us will not admit that this is failure; if there is something remote and hieratic in the figure of Aeneas, it is because he combines the austerity of a Stoic philosopher with the sanctity of a Roman *pontifex maximus* and of an ancestral divinity as well. A true statesman Aeneas is indeed and, though a lover of peace, a true soldier, after the type of Wordsworth’s “Happy Warrior,”

Who, doomed to go in company with Pain,
And Fear, and Bloodshed, miserable train!
Turns his necessity to glorious gain;
In face of these doth exercise a power
Which is our human nature’s highest dower;
Controls them and subdues, transmutes, bereaves
Of their bad influence, and their good receives:
By objects, which might force the soul to abate
Her feeling, rendered more compassionate.

¹ *Aen.* i. 10.

But he is essentially a philosopher, of the Stoic ideal, an ideal not realized till Marcus Aurelius for the first (and last!) time in history embodied Plato's longing for a king who should be also a philosopher—too late in history (or too early!) to accomplish in the state that good which Plato hoped for, though all men since have been better for the good that he accomplished in his own soul. Aeneas is, in fact, very near to our own ideal of the Christian gentleman, and has done as much as any character in literature to create that ideal.

He has the true philosophic attitude; he knows life's sorrow,¹ but also its consolation, for like the poet he has caught glimpses of its meaning and purpose,² and like the poet has his faith confirmed and crowned by mystical, prophetic vision. He is a true Stoic, believing that by enduring one overcomes.³ He has learned the hardest, and the greatest, lesson of philosophy, resignation to the will of heaven, the art of turning evil into good. Seneca⁴ cites Aeneas' *dis aliter visum*⁵ as the right motto for the Stoic—like the Christian's prayer, "Thy will be done!"—and well defines the difference between the good man's attitude and the bad man's: "Malus omnia in malum vertit, etiam quae cum specie optimi venerant; rectus atque integer corrigit prava fortunae et dura atque aspera ferendi scientia mollit." This is no indolent resignation, however, for, with Marcus Aurelius, Aeneas knows that, since failures are inevitable in the path of progress, the only thing to do is to get up at once after a fall and go on one's way uncomplaining, that persistent effort is the price of salvation: ἐκκρουσθέντα πάλιν ἐπαμείναι, καὶ ἀσμενίζειν εἰ τὰ πλείω ἀνθρωπικώτερα, καὶ φιλεῖν τοῦτο ἐφ' ὃ ἐπανέρχῃ.⁶

His enemies seem to feel that he becomes most human under the seductions of Dido, and are quick to assert that he is intolerably inhuman when he leaves Dido and returns to duty, that philosophy

¹ See *Aen.* vi. 719–21.

² *Aen.* ii. 777: "Non haec sine numine divom Eveniunt."

³ *Aen.* v. 710: "Superanda omnis fortuna ferendo est," words addressed to him, to be sure, but voicing his own thought.

⁴ Epistle 98, 3 f.

⁵ *Aen.* ii. 428.

⁶ v. 9: "Having been defeated, to go on again, and to be content if the greater part of your actions is more worthy of a man, and to love that to which you return."

which is the real mistress of his heart. But the fact is that even here, paradoxical as it may seem, piety and pity are one thing, that his devotion to duty includes his duty to Dido and involves the truest sympathy with her. Her duty is to Carthage; his, he has at last been clearly shown, is to Italy; separation is the only way of salvation for them both. Realizing their sin, they must both put it behind them at once; delay would be dalliance, and, worse than weakness, the basest cruelty on the part of Aeneas. Virgil never lacks sympathy—that quality, at any rate, is his pre-eminently among poets—and it is quite inconceivable that Virgil's hero is lacking in sympathy. Having failed in his duty and realized his failure, Aeneas has nothing else to do but face resolutely the other way, without repinings for himself or sentimental weakness for his seductress; any other conduct would be that of a "craven" indeed. He has to cut the knot, the tangle that he and she have made of their lives, and he does it with one stroke, in the quickest and kindest way:

Dixit, vaginaque eripit ensem
Fulmineum, strictoque ferit retinacula ferro.

—iv. 579.

He must put an end to an intolerable situation and return at once to the path of duty, leaving Dido free to do the same. Otherwise, he and she would be involved in a common ruin of character and a common betrayal of the great trusts committed to them. That he reasserts his better nature and returns to his ideal marks the epic hero; that she finds escape from her madness only in death marks the tragic heroine.¹

The confusion, not to call it hypocrisy, in our modern point of view is indicated by the curious fact that our refined moral sentiment seems never to object very seriously to Aeneas' amour with Dido, but only to his desertion of her; not to his lapse from duty, but to his return to duty; not to his human fall into temptation, but to his heroic recovery of himself at the direct bidding of heaven. Even Professor Lodge admits that the passion to which Aeneas

¹ See the very appreciative essay by John Richard Green, "Aeneas: a Vergilian Study," in *Stray Studies from England and Italy*, London 1892; and Henry's remarks on *pius Aeneas* (*Aen.* i. 381) in his *Aeneidea*.

yielded was "bad only because it was counter to the will of the gods." It is, however, the will of the gods, which is one with the moral law to the poet in his deepest thinking, that constitutes the difference between good and evil. Aeneas hardly realizes at first that the attractions of Dido and of Carthage are a temptation "counter to the will of the gods," but when he is made by direct revelation to realize this, he does the only right thing by submitting to the will of the gods. Surely the modern view is "specious." Aeneas had to go; the tragic poet has to deal with the myth that already exists. In reading any tragedy we must accept the legend, whether we like it or not. Nobody likes the myth of Oedipus, but everybody admires the masterpiece that Sophocles wrought out of such material. Oedipus did kill his father and marry his mother, and Aeneas did leave Dido, and the tragedy in each case is the work of fate. We pity Oedipus and never for a moment think of him as guilty of parricide and incest; we should pity Aeneas too, except that Virgil has made Dido the protagonist of his drama, and all our pity is for the time taken up with her.

To Virgil, however, the sin of Aeneas, like that of Dido—"oblitos famae melioris amantes" (221), "regnorum inmemores turpique cupidine captos" (194)—is the momentary forgetfulness of duty, the lowering of high ideals, the surrender to sensual temptation. The temptation is all the more insidious that it appeals to natural human instincts, that passion is blended with higher feelings, that the love of woman which wins response from the lonely widower means also the love of home in a homeless wanderer and the love of country in a "man without a country," yearning above all things for the promised land where he may rest at last—perhaps after all to be realized here in Africa. Not least of Dido's attractions for Aeneas is her obvious fondness for the beloved boy Ascanius. Everything conspires to make the temptation wear all the aspects of duty as well as allurement. We cannot find it in our hearts to blame Aeneas greatly for his fall; we cannot forget either that all the seduction was on the side of Dido.¹ It is Dido's

¹ A very designing widow according to Mr. Theodore Williams' rendering of lines 191 ff., "Trojan-born Aeneas having come, Dido, the lovely widow, looked his way, Deigning to wed!"

sin that has involved Aeneas; it is not he that has brought ruin upon her. It is honorable to his chivalric feeling—modern enough, this, to suit the least sympathetic critic—that no word of reproach against Dido leaves his lips. He does not say, like the hero of a Hebrew story, “The woman tempted me.” And even Dido realizes this; her reproach, like that of the modern critic, is that Aeneas leaves her. The modern critic cannot comprehend *pietas*—is it because his gods are less real than Virgil’s?—and Dido could not comprehend it, for she had broken her most solemn oath to the gods. What else than *pietas* is it which makes Aeneas follow the express will of the gods, when it is hardest to follow, when it leads him away from Dido? Virgil appropriately recalls the epithet *pious* (it is the first occurrence in book iv) even at the point where to most of us Aeneas seems to exhibit least piety or pity; for his return to duty requires that he show himself—whatever he feels—unmoved by Dido’s entreaties and reproaches. Such is our modern point of view and such is Virgil’s power in arousing our sympathy with Dido, that when she falls unconscious after pouring out her impassioned appeals to Aeneas, in vain, the “at *pious* Aeneas” that follows¹ comes upon us at first with a genuine shock. But Virgil meant what he said; Aeneas was never more *pious* than at this difficult moment when all his sympathies were with Dido and yet he had to turn his back upon her and close his ears to her plea and that of his own heart; duty has never achieved a more painful triumph over human inclination; *pietas* was never more truly *pietas* than at this supreme crisis when its two elements of piety and pity, duty and love, seemed hopelessly unreconcilable. Such moral conflict is the essence of tragedy, and Aeneas comes out purified from the conflict; by abandoning his sin and his partner in sin he transfigures what seemed a fatal necessity into a moral victory.

At *pious* Aeneas, quamquam lenire dolentem
solando cupit et dictis avertere curas,
multa gemens magnoque animum labefactus amore,
jussa tamen divom exsequitur.

And yet, in his devotion to duty, Aeneas, though he longs to solace and soothe her agonized heart and with words of affection to assuage her passion

¹ *Aen.* iv. 393.

and pain, though groaning sore and shaken to the very soul by the great love he feels for her, none the less follows out the bidding of the gods.

There is no lack of feeling here: his firmness is the truest pity, and his tenderness and sympathy would be clear enough to us, if everything else did not pale before the lurid glow of Dido's madly impassioned speeches. I cannot see any coldness in

Nec me meminisse pigebit Elissae,
Dum memor ipse mei, dum spiritus hos regit artus.

—335.

Aeneas' words have the same tone of tragic passion and pity as Hamlet's

"Remember thee! Ay, thou poor ghost, while memory holds a seat in this distracted globe."

And among the most pathetic of the "pathetic half-lines" is Aeneas' broken utterance, "Italiam non sponte sequor" (361). The pathos of the meeting with Dido in the "Lugentes Campi" is no longer due to Dido—she is restored to her forgiving and loving husband—but is due to the true feeling of Aeneas' address in touching words, among the saddest in all that book so steeped in the "lacrimae rerum," from the mournful opening, "Infelix Dido," to the mournful close, "Quem fugis? extremum fato quod te adloquor hoc est"—words freighted "with the anguish of all partings, beneath the pressure of separate eternities."²

If one had any doubt left as to Aeneas' feelings, these words would remove it forever. The meeting with Dido in Hades is instructive in other ways for the understanding of the tragedy. She has paid

¹ *Aen.* vi. 466.

² *Classical Essays*, by F. W. H. Myers, p. 118. Servius' comment on 466 is worth quoting: "*Extremum*: quia post mortem tenebit alterum circulum, [is this the first occurrence of the Dantesque conception of circles in Hell?] viris fortibus scilicet, non amantibus datum." Aeneas has proved himself a strong man by overcoming his love; Dido's weakness could end it only by death. Ovid, who knew his Virgil, saw no lack of feeling in Aeneas; he represents him as moved to tears by the remembrance of Dido, "Flet tamen admonitu motus, Elissa, tui," (*Fasti* iii. 612), and fully conscious of his indebtedness to her, "Nil non debemus Elissae" (*ib.* 623). Silius Italicus, with both Virgil and Ovid in mind, dwells on Aeneas' grief at leaving Dido:

Tellurem hanc juro, vota inter nostra frequenter
Auditam vobis, juro caput, Anna, tibi que
Germanaeque tuae dilecti, invitus, Iuli,
Respicens, aegerque animi tum regna reliqui | Vestra, etc.

—viii. 106.

for her sin by suicide, her faithlessness is forgiven, and she is restored to her husband's love—not all unhappy in the Fields of Sorrow. She is not suffering torment, but undergoing purgation; for Virgil's Hades is not, like Dante's *Inferno*, merely a place of punishment, and unlike Homer's shadowy world it is full of purpose and meaning: here too *pietas* reigns supreme. Dante—whose poem, says F. W. H. Myers, is the most important of aids to the right apprehension of Virgil¹—places the most pathetic of all his characters, Francesca da Rimini, in “the band where Dido is” (“la schiera ov' è Dido”), in the Circle of the Incontinent, who are driven along incessantly by a violent wind, “la bufera infernal che mai non resta” (*Inferno*, V, 31), symbolic of the passions that swayed them in life. Dido is in a group with other lustful oriental queens, Semiramis and Cleopatra, and Virgil points her out as “colei che s'ancise amorosa, e ruppe fede al cener di Sicheo” (“her who slew herself for love, and broke faith with the ashes of Sychaeus”).² It is the broken oath that brands her sin for Dante as for Virgil: she had solemnly invoked the Almighty to hurl her to the depths of hell, if she should violate her vow; and now she wanders in the lower world, but still finds pity there.³

For Aeneas the descent into Hades is a further test of his *pietas*,⁴ the supreme evidence of it,⁵ and most of all a triumphant justification of it. Not till then does he realize the full meaning of his divine mission and receive the inspiration that leads him to ultimate

¹ *Classical Essays*, p. 107. If it is true that “Homer made Virgil,” it is certainly no less true that Virgil made Dante. Dante prides himself on his knowledge of Virgil's “high tragedy”, and represents his master as saying to him:

Così il canta
L'alta mia tragedia in alcuno loco;
Ben lo sai tu che la sai tutta quanta.

—*Inferno*, XX, 112.

² So Claudian, addressing the Princess Serena, ill-fated daughter of the emperor Honorius, classes Dido with Helen among the bad examples in literature: “Quos Smyrna dedit, quos Mantua libros Percurrens damnas Helenam nec parcis Elissae; Nobiliora tenent animos exempla pudicos” (*Laus Serenae* 147).

³ Servius on *Aen.* vi. 451: “*Errabat*: vagabatur et bene allusit, quia et amaverat et se interemerat; ut quasi incertum esset, quem circulem posset tenere.”

⁴ vi. 461 ff: “Sed me iussa deum, quae nunc has ire per umbras, Per loca senta situ cogunt noctemque profundam, Imperiis egere suis.”

⁵ 688: “Vicit iter durum pietas.”

success. Duty and love have brought him even down to Hades, and there he learns the great lesson that is worth all it may cost—that salvation for men involves suffering and struggle, that self-sacrifice is but a stepping-stone to victory, that all life, in the other world as in this, is a process of purgation and ascent, and that his own race is the chosen people to lead mankind to its highest realization of itself. The most conspicuous quality in the illustrious line of his descendants who pass before him in prophetic vision is his own *pietas*, Roman devotion to duty, self-sacrificing service of fatherland and fellow-man.¹ To Aeneas it is revealed, what few men are given clearly to see, that the law of the universe, the process which works out the destiny of man, is one with the moral law in his own heart. For him henceforth the stern face of duty is forever irradiated with the light of love. For us, too, this episode is a revelation of Virgil's conception of destiny as the divine law which is to effect the regeneration of humanity by the instrumentality of the Roman race, and of duty as co-operation with that law. The divine law itself puts on the aspect of *pietas*—"summa deum Pietas"²—and Virgil's hero, prophet of this greatest of the gods, is shown to be in very truth *Pius Aeneas*.

¹ 769: "Pariter pietate vel armis Egregius"; 772: "Umbrata gerunt civili tempora quercu"; 823: "Vincet amor patriae."

² Statius, *Silvae* III. iii. 1.

A COMPREHENSIVE VIEW OF HOMERIC CRITICISM CAUER'S "GRUNDFRAGEN DER HOMERKRITIK"

BY FRANK COLE BABBITT
Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.

The new and enlarged edition of Cauer's *Grundfragen der Homerkritik*¹ will be welcomed by all who care for the sane study of the Homeric poems. Sanity, above all else, is characteristic of Cauer's work. So many battles have raged and still are raging over the prostrate "Corpus Homeri" that there is need of someone who, like the calm Apollo of the Zeus temple at Olympia, shall bid the strife to cease. This Cauer tries to do, not by divine authority, but by an appeal to reason and to fact, and with an exhortation that those who think they disagree, but who, in reality, are often in essential agreement, shall work together to further the real knowledge of Homer. He shows that much of the polemic has been unnecessary, and he clearly marks out the ground on which the future combats may take place.

As peacemaker, then, Cauer deserves the greatest praise, but whether his efforts will be appreciated by those whom he strives to reconcile, or whether he will meet with cordial hatred from both sides, time alone can tell.

Cauer's book is divided into three parts, of which the first deals with the text and language of the poems, the second with an analysis of their contents, and the third with what may perhaps be called the "higher criticism." The index, unfortunately, is very meager. The first and second parts are taken largely from the first edition, but they have been amplified and brought down to date. The third part is largely new, but nevertheless it stands as a brilliant proof of the fact that a background of fairly minute knowledge is absolutely necessary to him who would deal at all convincingly with higher things.

¹ Paul Cauer, *Grundfragen der Homerkritik*. Zweite, stark erweiterte und zum Teil ungearbeitete Auflage. Leipzig: Verlag von S. Hirzel, 1909. Pp. viii+552. M. 12.

To begin, then, with the history of the text—granting that the purpose of text-criticism is to determine what an author originally wrote—the problem for Homer is, of course, greatly complicated. When were the poems committed to writing? in what dialect? What changes were introduced by committing them to writing? What changes have since arisen in the transmission? Shall we endeavor to reconstruct the text of the Alexandrian time? or that of the Attic people of the 4th or 5th century B.C.? Or shall we try to go farther back to the time when *Vau* was a living sound? or still farther to the time when the poems were composed, and, if we so believe, shall we try to translate them back into the Aeolic (?) dialect? And if we cannot square the poems themselves with our theories and beliefs, shall we go even farther, and cut out as spurious the offending portions? Needless to say there has been no dearth of enthusiasts who have been willing to attempt one or more of these tasks.

By way of clearing the ground it is worth while to record the rise and fall of one belief which for a time bade fair to undermine our confidence in the comparative integrity of our present Homeric text tradition.

Most scholars will recall the considerable sensation produced by the publication (in 1891) of Vol. VII of the Cunningham memoirs of the Royal Irish Academy, containing the first of the papyri showing large dissent from our present Homeric vulgate. The fragment contains either the beginning or the end of 39 lines (Λ 502-37), of which only 28 correspond exactly with the present vulgate. One line of the vulgate is omitted entirely, four additional lines not otherwise known, are included in the text, and of the seven remaining lines two must have been quite different from the vulgate, while the other five contain minor variations. Of the five minor variations one is recorded as a reading of Zenodotus, one is mentioned as a correction in Venetus A, and a third is evidently due to a change of construction caused by one of the added lines. No wonder that scholars at the time thought that here was evidence of "the radical treatment which the text of Homer has suffered at the hands of the Alexandrine grammarians."

Since that time, however, other less fragmentary papyri of the same sort have come to light, which show that these eccentric (or, as the Germans say, "wilde") texts are, in general, inferior to the vulgate. It may be worth while to quote here a portion of one of these fragments (since they are not always generally accessible to teachers) from one of the six Geneva papyri published in 1894. This contains, in three columns, Λ 788-M 9. The second column, containing Λ 810-34, is nearly intact, and it is thoroughly representative (even in its errors) of the "eccentric" papyri. The transcript here given is based on Ludwich, *Homervulgate*, p. 51, and only those lines are noted which show variations from the vulgate. Lines numbered *a*, *b*, *c* are not in the vulgate. The text of the vulgate for each line precedes that of the papyrus.

- Λ 811: σκάζων ἐκ πολέμου· κατὰ δὲ νότιος ῥέεν ἰδρῶς
σκάζων ἐκ πολέμου·] ἀπὸ δὲ νότιος ῥέεν ἰδρῶς]
- 814: τὸν δὲ ἰδὼν ᾧκτειρε Μενoitίον ἀλκιμος υἱός,
τὸν δ[ε] ἰδὼν ᾧκτειρε Μενoit[ίω]ν ἀγλαὸς υἱός,
- 815: καὶ ῥ' ὀλοφυρόμενος ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα
ἐν τ' ἄρα οἱ φῦ χειρὶ, ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἐκ τ' ὀνόμαζε
- 821: ἦ ἦδη φθίσονται ὑπ' αὐτοῦ δουρὶ δαμέντες.
[ἦ] ἦδη φθεῖται ὑπ' αὐτοῦ δουρὶ δαμέντες
- 822: Τὸν δ' αὖτ' Εὐρύπυλος βεβλημένος ἀντίον ἦδα
Τὸν δηνπ Εὐρύπυ[λο]ς πεπνυμένος ἀντίον ἦδα
- 823: οὐκέτι, διογενὲς Πατρόκλεις, ἄλκαρ Ἀχαιῶν
οὐκέτι, διογενὲς Π[α]τροκλῆς, ἦμαρ Ἀχαιῶν
- 827: χερσὶν ὑπο Τρώων· τῶν δὲ σθένος ὄρνυται αἰέν.
χερσὶν ὑπ[ο] Τρώων· τοῦ δὲ σθένος αἰὲν ὄρωρε
- 827a Ἔκτορος, ὅς τάχα νῆας ἐνιπλείσῃ πυρὶ κηλείω[ι]
- 827b δηῶσας Δαναοὺς παρὰ θῖν' ἁλός· αὐτὰρ Ἀχιλλεὺς
- 827c [εἰσ]θλὸς ἐ[ὼν] Δαναῶν οὐ κήδεαι οὐδ' ἐλαίρει.
- 830 νίζ' ὕδατι λλιαρῶ, ἐπὶ δ' ἥπια φάρμακα πάσσε,
[νίζ' ὕ]δατι λλιαρῶ ἐπὶ δ' ἥπια φάρμακα πάσσων

Most of the variations are self-explanatory, but the doubling of the liquid in *νότιος* (811) and *λλιαρῶ* (830) to "make position" is noteworthy. In 814 a Breslau MS (Rehdigeranus 26) has γρ[άφεται] ἀγλαός, and in 812 γρ' πεπνυμένος, showing pretty clearly some close relation between the archetype of the MS and that of the papyrus. So also in 827 the reading *τοῦ*, which is

found also in three Paris MSS, and which is intelligible with Ἑκτορος in the next line, but otherwise difficult, seems to point to some connection between the traditions of these MSS and that of the papyrus.

One might perhaps hastily conclude that such eccentric texts were peculiar to Egypt, but (as Ludwich has shown¹) the fact that they may have been fairly common, is proved by some of the Homeric quotations in the pre-Alexandrine classical authors. For example, the quotation of Ψ 77-91 in the oration of Aeschines against Timarchus, 149 (the longest Homeric quotation in a classical author), shows a text with exactly such vagaries.

Other fragments of early papyri show a text agreeing almost exactly with the vulgate, so it is evident, from this fact as well as from the quotations, that texts containing the present vulgate existed side by side with the "eccentric" texts, until finally the latter, so far as present knowledge goes, appear to have been forced out by the influence of the Alexandrine Library. The sanest statement of the facts is to be found in *The Hibeh Papyri*, I, pp. 68 ff.

The integrity, therefore, of our present vulgate seems to be vindicated; but what shall we say about the vulgate itself? There is no modern edition of Homer that follows any one MS, nor is there any one MS (not even Venetus A) that can be safely followed. How, therefore, are the texts of our present editions determined? Largely in reality by subjective judgment on the part of the editors; not, of course, in much that affects the general meaning, but in relatively minor matters: ἄψ or αἰψ? ἐπὶ οἴνοπα or ἐπ' ἀπείρονα (A 350)? πᾶσι or δαῖτα (A 5)? δεινδρέφ or δένδρει (Γ 152)? These are samples, taken at random, of "marginal readings," of which the editor must print one in his text and record the other. Sometimes the decision is extremely easy, sometimes extremely difficult. Cauer, in his chapters on the MSS, the Vul-

¹ Arthur Ludwich, *Die Homervulgate als voralexandrinisch Erweisen*. Leipzig, 1898. Neither Ludwich nor Cauer seems to know of the article on "Homeric Quotations in Plato and Aristotle," by G. E. Howes in the *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. VI, which is highly spoken of by Adam in his edition of Plato's *Republic*. Professor Howe's peculiar contribution to the subject is a preliminary test of the value of the text tradition of Plato and Aristotle in the matter of other quotations whose accuracy can be proved by other evidence, and it seems to prove that variant readings in their quotations are always worthy of careful consideration.

gate, Aristarchus, and the pre-Alexandrine text, has pointed out the method which must be applied, and the manner of its application, but the examples require too much space to be repeated here.

The comparative valuation of the MSS of Homer has undergone considerable modification in recent years, largely through the labors of Allen, Leaf, and Ludwig;¹ and certain MSS, which have been grouped together and designated by Allen as *h*, are shown, in spite of careless errors, to have a superior value in many readings. Ludwig is not so enthusiastic for this group, but Caer points out the fact that many of Ludwig's objections do not seem to be well-founded. Among the tares may often be found a superior quality of wheat which, if carefully gathered, gives promise of large and fruitful increase.

So much for those cases for which more than one reading is creditably attested from antiquity; but what shall we say when the attested reading is pretty surely wrong? Leaf, in the preface to his first edition of the *Iliad*, stated with some apparent pride that "with these exceptions [*εἶος* and the genitive singular in *-oo*] . . . there is, I believe, no reading in the text which cannot be shown to have some support in ancient tradition, or at least in the readings of some MS of respectability." Now whether one write such genitives as *-oo* or, with Van Leeuwen, as *-oio*, is a minor matter, but it is evident that in writing such a form an editor is following no MS but is going behind the MS tradition. If this be done, the question at once forces itself on us whether other genitives which according to the MSS end in *-ov* should not be changed into *-oo* to the evident betterment of the meter. For example, *ἐξ ὅο* instead of *ἐξ οὖ* at the beginning of A 6 would greatly lighten a metrically heavy verse. So *δῆμοο φῆμῖς* instead of *δῆμου φῆμῖς*, ξ 239, makes a cacophonous spondaic verse dactylic. When one has laid his hand to the plow to overturn such forms, is there any point at which he may stop and look backward, and still be worthy of the critic's kingdom?

Of the same sort is the question of restoring *Vau* or allowing for its restoration. (Whether one actually prints it or not is com-

¹ An account of the literature of Homeric text criticism, 1881-1906, by Ch. Harder in Bursian's *Jahresbericht*, CXXXVIII, 1-112.

paratively a minor matter.) It may be worth while to reproduce here a few examples from Cauer's book:

	MSS	Conjectural Emendations	Papyri
B 213	ὅς ῥ' ἔπεα	ὅς ἔπεα (i.e., <i>φέπεα</i>). Bentley	ὅσσ' ἔπεα (a saving blunder for ὅς). Pap. Brit. Mus. 126
B 316	τὴν δ' ἐλελιζάμενος	τὴν δὲ ἐλιζάμενος. (i.e., <i>φελιξ</i> -.) Bentley	δελιζάμενος. <i>Ibid.</i>
B795	τῷ μιν εἰσαμένη	τῷ μιν φεισαμένη. Heyne	Τῷ μιν εἰσαμένη. Pap. Oxon.
Γ 103	οἴσσετε δ' ἄρν'	οἴσσετε φάρν'. Heyne	οἴσσετε ἄρν'. Pap. Brit. Mus. 126
Z 493	πᾶσιν, ἐμοὶ δὲ μά- λιστα, τοὶ Ἰλίφ ἐγγεγάασιν	πᾶσι, μάλιστα δ' ἐμοὶ τοὶ Ἰλίφ (i.e., <i>φίλιφ</i>). Hoffmann, from the quotation in Epictet. <i>Diss.</i> iii. 22, 108	πᾶσι, μάλιστα δ' ἐμοὶ. Pap. Oxyrh., III, p. 87
Ψ 198 ὠκέα δ' Ἰρίς ἦλθ(ε)....	ὠκα δὲ Ἰρίς (i.e., <i>φῖρίς</i>). Bentley	ὠκα δὲ Ἰρίς. (3d century B.C.) Grenf. II, 11
Ω 320	ὑπὲρ ἄστεος. δι' ἄσ- τεος. Ven. A in marg.	διὰ ἄστεος (i.e., <i>φάστεος</i>).	διὰ ἄστεος. Banks Pap. and Allen's <i>h</i> family of MSS

Any one of these alone would not be convincing, since the papyri in which they occur contain a fair amount of careless mistakes, but, taken together, they bear eloquent testimony to the critical acumen of the scholars who originally made these corrections, and it should be no great surprise if some day a papyrus or even a later MS should confirm Bentley's or a similar reading of A 18 and 19:

ἔμμι θεοὶ μὲν δοῖεν Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες
ἐκπέρσαι Πριάμοιο πόλιν, καὶ οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι.

Certainly conjectural (if it be conjectural) emendation has been of late greatly vindicated, and every editor of Homer is bound hereafter to treat it with distinguished consideration. If we could have early papyri for the whole of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, the number of conjectural emendations which would undoubtedly be confirmed would be fairly astounding.

Grammatical and dialectic knowledge has also made great advance in comparatively recent times and some of this admits of

ready application to the Homeric text. A single example here must suffice. The form *κέχονδα* ought to be the second perfect of *χανδάνω*, fut. *χείσομαι* (like *πέπονθα* and *πείσομαι* from *πάσχω*), but the MSS tradition gives always *κέχανδα* (e.g., Ψ 268). Fick proposed to restore the form with omicron, and now in a papyrus in the British Museum we read (Ω 192) [*κεχ*]ονδει. Undoubtedly correct; and if this be correct, then by the same token we must read everywhere (e.g., κ 465) *πέπασθε* (for **πεπαθ-τε*), not *πέποσθε*, else is our knowledge vain, and from the past there may come to us at any time the work of a dead hand to put us to shame.

Interesting, too, is Cauer's demonstration of the possibilities of errors in our text due to the transference of the poems to the Ionic alphabet. Aside from the unmetrical *ἔως* and *τέως* for ΕΟΣ and ΤΕΟΣ (i.e., ἦος and τῆος), might be cited *ἀμφὶ πυρὴν* ἔγρετο λαός, i.e., ἤγρετο (from ἀγείρω), *gathered*, not *watched*. So, in forms like *θείομεν*, possibly even in *προίειν* (imperfect first person of *προΐημι*) *ει* might be held to represent the lengthened form of *ε* but *βείομεν*, *στείομεν*, *τεθνειώς*, and the like, still demand explanation, and receive none.

In the matter of the "assimilated" forms of verbs in *-άω* Cauer's demonstration of the facts is very clear. It is not likely, however, that everybody will follow him in his acceptance of Wackernagel's theory on the subject, viz., that such forms were first contracted, and later "distracted"; e.g., *ἀντιᾱούσᾱν* (A 31) first became *ἀντιῶσᾱν* (*sic*), which later was resolved into *ἀντιῶσᾱν*. The argument for this rests mainly on the indifference to metrical considerations which our MSS sometimes show in forms like *ἔως* and *τέως* and in those few cases where the genitive in *-οο* is to be restored. In *ἔως* and *τέως* the Attic Greeks might well have fancied a sort of anaclassis, since the required quantities were there, only differently distributed. If forms like *ἀντιάουσσαν* went the course prescribed (i.e., *ἀντιῶσᾱν*, *ἀντιῶσᾱν*), then we should rightly expect the genitives in *-οο* to have been expanded accordingly (i.e., *Ἀιδῶλῶος* for *Ἀιδόλου*, *sic*), which bears the same relation to *Αἰολος* that *ῥου* (B 325, a 70) does to *ῥς*; but since *ῥου* happens to be the only example, it seems more natural to think that the assimilation took place under the influence of the contracted forms,

but not through the medium of contraction. But if there is any one thing that proves the lateness of these forms it is the uniformity with which the unassimilated forms can be restored.

There are two matters upon which Cauer is very insistent, namely (1) that the Homeric poems were not committed to writing until the time of Pisistratus, and (2) that *Vau* was never a living sound in the Ionic dialect. The trouble with both of these views, if one may venture to say so, is that they are too narrow. Cauer sets forth in a very admirable way the evidence which we have for the great influence of the Attic recension upon all others, and, so far as the evidence goes, he may be said to make out his case. But this, perhaps, pays insufficient regard to the possibilities or even to the probabilities. The predominance of Attic influence upon practically all of our text tradition is only too clear. If one only glance through the quotations of the non-Attic poets in Bergk's *Poetae lyrici* he will see how our tradition is dependent almost exclusively upon Attic or atticizing writers. Tyrtaeus according to all tradition wrote almost wholly in an atticized epic dialect; but did he? Certainly we have no evidence to the contrary, and, if chance had not preserved a marching song in atticized Doric, we should have practically no trace of Doric in his poems.

According to all the evidence known previous to 1895, Simonides of Ceos, in his epigram on the Corinthians who fell at Salamis (Bergk 96), wrote ποτ' ἐναίομεν ἄστυ Κορίνθον, and the possibility of ποτ' ἐναίομες ἄστυ φορίνθο[υ] would have remained a most remote possibility, had not the chance discovery of a worn stone step of a stairway in Salamis (*Ath. Mitt.*, 1897, XXII, 52) shown the existence of another tradition? And so in Homer it seems that we should at least admit other possibilities beside the facts which Cauer so aptly relates. And so with *Vau*, the fact that there is no attested case of the appearance of the letter in any eastern Ionic dialect does not prove that it may never have been used, and it can only be a question of how far back one must go before he shall find that letter in actual living use.

It may seem strange to suggest that there is even now great need of a new critical edition of Homer, but anybody who has tried to find from the present critical editions the actual readings of the

various MSS in any specific passage must realize the frequent inadequacy of the record—and Ludwich's edition is far short of perfection. There is here opportunity for a young, well-trained scholar endowed with critical judgment and common-sense to rear a monument more enduring than bronze.

We in America, one may remark parenthetically, are confronted by a very practical question in this matter of establishing a correct (?) text of Homer. There are in general use at this time in school editions three different forms of the text: (1) the vulgate, represented by Seymour (who followed closely Ameis-Hentze) and Keep; (2) the conservative, but emended text, reprinted by Benner, who follows Cauer; and (3) the radically emended text, represented by Sterrett, who follows Van Leeuwen and Da Costa. Which of these texts shall be used in setting examinations? And is it fair that a pupil who has been taught the vulgate shall be asked to translate Van Leeuwen, or vice versa?

The second part of Cauer's book might be called the background of the Homeric poems, for it is an attempt to go behind the scenes of the poems in somewhat the same manner as that in which he attempts to go behind the traditional text. As a result, we seem to see here and there behind the thin veil of the present poems, the shadowy, gigantic figures of an earlier age, which move about, clad in ancient or even primitive armor, and engage in combat one with another, sometimes even to the death. To portray this in all its detail would far exceed the limits of space here prescribed, and would often require a close reproduction of Cauer's own words. Not that this is all original with him. He often combines the results of other scholars, giving always due credit. Well worthy of study is the picture that he gives of the heroic poems, celebrating the local heroes of Thessaly and Boeotia, their transference to the land of Asia, their gradual accretion around the great central theme of the expedition against Troy, their appropriation by the encroaching Ionic peoples, and their return to the land of their birth. Hector is originally a local hero of Thessaly, where also is Thebe, and even Agamemnon becomes the ruler of the Argos in Thessaly, while only a later tradition makes him lord of the Peloponnesus. One

original Ajax (son of Oileus) has later become two, and local feuds have become international.

Parallel instances of the migrations of poems and peoples are cited, and the list could probably be considerably amplified. If one may compare small things with great, many a college graduate has been surprised to find current at another college a legend which he had supposed to be original with his own institution, and that, too, with an implicit belief in its integrity. And as a parallel for the extension of a local name one may cite the enlargement of the term "Yankee" from its designation of the people of the small state of Connecticut to include New England, and, later, under the contrasting influence of war, all the northern states, and finally, in loose usage, nearly half a continent.

An important part of the background of the Homeric poem is, of course, the culture of the ages immediately preceding. "Mycaenology" is by no means so simple a subject as it appeared to be before the discoveries in Crete, and questions touching the relations of this culture to Crete and to the East, as well as the points of contact between the "Aegean" culture and the Homeric poems, often present problems not easy to answer.¹

Many will be justly grateful to Cauer for his very clear and judicial statement of the Leucas-Ithaca question. Four islands are repeatedly named by Homer on the west coast of Greece, and in many ways this description of Ithaca fits better with Leucas than with the present Ithaca. The island with its two harbors (δ 844), where the suitors lay in wait for Telemachus, the meaning of *χθαμαλή* = "near the land," the situation of Leucas (Ithaca) toward the distant west (N.W.) as seen from the northwest shore of the Peloponnesus, the coming on foot to Ithaca, the actual rising of this land geologically, are among the points treated by Cauer in this connection. At the same time he recognizes the difficulties, e.g., the use of *χθαμαλή* in another connection, and the difficulty of bridging the gap in the history of the changing of names. Charming indeed is the manner in which Demodocus-like, Cauer relates the story of the strife between Wilamowitz-Moellendorf-Odysseus and Wilhelm-Doerpfeld-Achilles.

¹ Many of these matters are briefly discussed by C. H. and H. B. Hawes in *Crete the Forerunner of Greece*. New York, 1909.

And finally we come to the matter of higher criticism. To illustrate by one of the simplest possible examples: in the ninth book of the *Odyssey*, line 483, the Cyclops is represented as hurling a massive rock at the ship of Odysseus; the rock falls in front of the ship, and narrowly misses hitting the rudder. It is at once evident that this particular line makes nonsense here, and that it must have been written into the passage from line 540 where the second rock falls behind the ship. And this fact was recognized by the ancient critics. This then illustrates, in the simplest way, application of what may be termed higher criticism. We find that a particular line, or passage, or even a book, is or is not in harmony with a larger idea or conception, and the larger idea may be based on actual content of other passages, as in the case cited, or on the culture or religion of the time, or on any of the manifold bits of evidence (archaeological, linguistic, or the like) which contribute to restore a picture of the period when the work was composed. It may even be based on the aesthetic feeling of the author or of his time. Such criticism is not necessarily destructive; it may equally well be constructive, and may serve to confirm the genuineness as well as the spuriousness of any particular passage, and it often exhibits very clear and definite results.

One great trouble with such criticism is that it is often made to depend on the subjective judgment of the critic. Granted that two things are not in harmony, which one is out of tune? Presumably the minor with the major, but which is the minor and which is the major? For example, Gemoll feels that he proved conclusively that Book K of the *Iliad* was written largely under the influence of the *Odyssey*, since much of it can be proved to have been borrowed or adapted from the *Odyssey*. On the other hand, Wilamowitz-Moellendorf maintains that line 65 of *Odyssey a* was copied directly from Book K (243) of the *Iliad*. It is evident that an application of the higher criticism here would tend to prove that these two statements were not in harmony, and were not likely to emanate from the same source!

More dangerous still is the higher criticism when it is based upon subjective feeling of the critic for what he thinks is the aesthetic taste of the author or of his time, and doubtless much of

the disrepute of higher criticism has come from too free application of this criterion. For example, when Wilamowitz-Moellendorf objects to the very beautiful passage at the end of the first book of the *Odyssey* (which describes Telemachus' retiring for the night, with the assistance of the old nurse Eurycleia) on the ground that Telemachus sits down on the bed before removing his shirt, and that a vigorous young man like Telemachus ought not to be sitting down anyway,¹ one can hardly refrain from suggesting to Wilamowitz-Moellendorf a well-known slang injunction on the subject.

Cauer's attitude toward this whole question seems very sane and rational. He is content to point out where, here and there, a bit of new material seems to have been used to patch up an older structure, or again where certain fragments of an older building have been employed in the construction of a new one. But he does not propose to tear down the whole structure, and to erect several smaller buildings in a neater and more chronological order.

While an attempt to reconstruct the original language or the original form of the Homeric poems is always interesting as a *tour de force*, yet such an attempt gives us only the *disiecta membra* of what was before a living body. To believe that a work like "Uriliad" of Robert (*Studien zur Ilias*, Berlin, 1901) with neither beginning nor end, and with forty-nine breaks in its text, many of them in the middle of a line, can represent the original form of a great epic is to stultify both the Greeks and ourselves. It is but some of the fragments of what was once a beautiful work of art. The poems are like a great picture, many times too large to be taken in by the eye at one time, and as one views it over he may distinguish here and there the work of different artists, but an attempt to cut out the portions which may have been the work of a single hand, and to piece them together to form a smaller and simpler canvas only destroys the unity which it seeks to attain. For the unity of

¹ It is perhaps worth while to quote the *ipissima verba*. They are to be found on p. 8 of Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Homerische Untersuchungen* (Berlin, 1884): "Wer kann ein bis auf die Füße reichendes Hemd (einen χιτῶν ποδῆρης) im Sitzen ausziehen? Telemachos, α 437, ἔζετο δ' ἐν λέκτρῳ, μαλακὸν δ' ἔκδυε χιτῶνα. Warum ist der junge Mann so müde, dass er sich dazu hinsetzt? weil B 42 Agamemnon ἔζετο ὀρθῶς, μαλακὸν δ' ἐνδυε χιτῶνα." There must be a "hitch" somewhere!

the epic is really a series of units; or, in other words, the unity of the moment, not of consistency, and the reader is not greatly concerned with what is behind him or before him, so long as there is no great departure from the general plan; and the general plan of each of the poems stands out clearly, so that Aristotle could truthfully say (*Poet.*, chap. viii): "He made the *Odyssey*, and likewise the *Iliad*, to center round a simple action," and in this way the poems do possess an eternal unity.

Striking indeed, in some ways, is the analogy between the present state of the Homeric poems and that of the ancient city round which they center. One generation after another occupied the site of Troy, often knowing not with what or upon what they were building; and so the poems were presumably the creation or possession of one generation after another, who must often have been in ignorance of the source of the material which they were using. And as the Romans leveled the site of Troy, so, to a less extent, did Pisistratus and the Alexandrian scholars try to reduce to a sort of level the content of the poems. Clear of vision indeed must he be who in the mass of confusion at Troy can point out with sureness the origin of all the parts; nor can he afford to scorn the help of others, the geologist, the ethnographer, the archaeologist, and the surveyor, each of whom can make his contribution to the solution of the problem as a whole. And so, for the better understanding of the Homeric poems, the students of language, of paleography, of epigraphy, or comparative literature, as well as those devoted to the more immediate study of the poems, should labor together to advance our knowledge of the oldest, and in many ways the most important, remains of Greek literature.

IN MEMORIAM: DANIEL BONBRIGHT

BY O. F. LONG
Northwestern University

On November 27, 1912, Daniel Bonbright, head of the Department of Latin in Northwestern University, passed away after a brief illness at Daytona, Fla. He had long been a member of the American Philological Association, also of the Managing Committee of the American School in Rome, in fact almost from its inception. His distinguished services as an active teacher of Latin in one university had covered a period of fifty-four years, and his passing fitly merits the wider notice of the pages of this *Journal*.

Professor Bonbright was born in Youngstown, Pa., March 10, 1831. He studied at Dickinson College in 1846-48, and then transferring to Yale College, he was graduated from that institution in 1850, receiving his second degree in 1853. From the first his bent was in the line of teaching. After two years' experience in minor schools, he was called to Yale College as tutor, first in mathematics, 1854-55, and the following year in Latin. In this position he was brought into the intimacy of professional relations with his former teachers, Professors James Hadley, Thomas Thacher, and W. D. Whitney. What ideals he personally cherished, and what ambitions were aroused by closer contact with these great pioneer scholars, may be inferred from his deciding next to join the small group of American students who were then turning to the German universities for advanced work. A letter of President Woolsey's, written in 1856, to the trustees of Northwestern University, then but recently founded, dwells upon the scholarly ideals of the young tutor. Building certainly wiser than they knew, the trustees invited tutor Bonbright to become Northwestern's first professor of Latin, and they readily granted him permission for study abroad before assuming his work.

It is difficult with our numerous graduate schools for the present generation to realize what heart of oak and triple brass must have

strengthened the resolve of those who more than a half-century ago went to German universities as a preparation for teaching. American classical scholarship has happily profited by the courage and foresight of a few chosen men who were thus inspired. To this select group Professor Bonbright belonged. With a modesty that was even excessive, he spoke but seldom of his own career, but on a memorable evening in 1905 he gave to a group of graduate students an account of those German days, when he heard, among others, the lectures of Jahn, Ritter, and Ritschl at Bonn, of Bopp, Haupt, and Mommsen at Berlin, and of Sauppe and von Leutsch at Göttingen. With Hermann Sauppe his relations were closer than those of student and professor; the two maintained a correspondence for some years, and there hangs upon the walls of his late study a photograph of Sauppe, bearing the significant inscription:

Den Fuss im Festen,
Den Blick zum Besten.

In the autumn of 1858 Professor Bonbright assumed his duties in Evanston, bringing to a small western college an endowment of scholarly training such as few older institutions in America could boast in that day. His interest in the College and in the community was broad, and at once his influence was felt in every line of work. Even for material growth he was often directly responsible, while in the darker days that came his loyalty was unswerving. More than one call to better known colleges he received and declined, with the plea that he was needed where he was. As the University grew no one surpassed him in zealous service and wise counsel; for deliberation and judgment he had in rare degree, and the crowning glory of old age, influence, was his long before the passing years had begun to mark him. And he was ever a willing counselor for the many who sought his advice, frank, direct, and unpretending. He had even the simplicity of greatness. Tender and pure, yet firm and uncompromising, he was a man of singularly peaceful temperament. He never broke even a friendly lance for the excitement of the encounter, but when Truth bade him speak he was her fearless and effective champion.

It is now an open secret that more than once Professor Bonbright declined the presidency of Northwestern, preferring to devote

himself to what he considered his legitimate work. For one period, however, he did serve as Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, and from 1900 to 1902 he was Acting President of the University. In fitting recognition of his merits Northwestern conferred upon him the degree of LL.D. in 1908, thus honoring his jubilee anniversary. Lawrence University had conferred the same degree in 1873.

According to Professor Bonbright's conception, the highest duty of a teacher lies in his service to the students and to the community. In his teaching he was authoritative and punctilious, yet always sympathetic. Unsparing in upholding standards, he was at the same time quick to discern latent ability in even the most unpromising source. The freshness of his interpretations, the wealth of illustration drawn from wide travels and from excursions into various literatures, brought to the student new ideals of culture. No groping uncertainty, or slovenliness of expression in rendering a choice passage was tolerated. His own versions were remarkable for their finish and grace. The English of even his conversation was unvaryingly, and it may be said without disparagement of others, conspicuously that of a cultured scholar.

As a teacher Professor Bonbright was keenly alive to the necessity of a suitable apparatus. In the growth of the Library he was especially interested, and it was through his advice that the important classical and philosophical library of Johann Schulze, a member of the Prussian ministry of public instruction, was brought to Northwestern in 1870. His own library is well selected and fairly extensive, and is the collection of a scholar abreast of progress at home and abroad. It was clearly the sweet serenity of books that made the strongest appeal, for he was a student and scholar of culture rather than an investigator in the modern sense. So far as the writer knows Professor Bonbright never published a line. In this single respect the example of his life, according to the strictest letter, cannot be urged upon the present generation; and yet his service towers high above the too often restricted influence of a specialist, and he lives imperishable in the larger life of a university and in the praise of literally thousands whom he trained and inspired.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE MIDDLE WEST AND SOUTH

The meeting will be held in Indianapolis, April 11 and 12. Following is a list of speakers and their subjects; some others will be added in the complete program next month.

PHILO M. BUCK, University of Nebraska: "The Classical Tradition and the Study of English."

H. V. CANTER, University of Illinois: "Does Our Method of Presenting the Classics to College Students Obtain the Best Results?"

HOWARD G. COLWELL, St. Louis High School: "Efficiency Tests for High-School Latin Teaching."

JOSEPH V. DENNEY, Ohio State University: "The Value of the Classics to Students of English."

FREDERICK M. FOSTER, University of Iowa: "The Divisions in the Plays of Terence."

WILLIAM G. HALE, University of Chicago: "The Participation of the Student in the Study of Beginning Latin."

FREDERIC A. HALL, Washington University: "A Comparison of the *Iphigenias* of Euripides, Goethe, and Racine."

FRANCIS W. KELSEY, University of Michigan: Subject to be announced later.

MISS HARRIET R. KIRBY, Columbus High School: "Ways and Means of Making Latin Popular."

GORDON J. LAING, University of Chicago: "Recent Excavations in Rome and Pompeii," illustrated.

MISS ELIZABETH MCGOREY, Cleveland High School: "High-School Latin and American Citizenship."

MISS OLIVIA POUND, Lincoln High School: "Application of the Principles of the Greek Lyric Tragedy to the Classical Dramas of Swinburne."

C. P. STEINMETZ, General Electric Co., Schenectady, N.Y.: "The Value of the Classics in Modern Education." This will be the Friday evening address.

GEORGE R. SWAIN, Lockport, Ill.: "A Visit to the Site of Alesia," illustrated.

Book Reviews

Homerische Probleme. II, Die Komposition der Odyssee. By
E. BELZNER. Leipzig: Teubner, 1912. Pp. viii+272. M. 8.

Dr. Belzner is at work on a series of Homeric Problems connected with the *Odyssey*. The first, "The Culture of the Odyssey," reached the conclusion that the cultural elements as shown in all its parts prove that the poem is the creation of a single epoch. See the review in *Amer. Jour. Phil.* XXXIII, 209 ff. The third volume is to be devoted to a discussion of the relationship existing between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. In this, the second of the series, the composition of the poem as a whole and the relation of the various parts are considered, especially with reference to the theories of Kirchhoff, Seeck, and Wilamowitz.

This book attempts to prove the essential unity of the *Odyssey* and to remove any lingering suspicions due to the writings of the scholars just mentioned.

It is one of the prominent arguments of Kirchhoff and his school that the Story of Telemachus began with the second book and that the first book is an afterthought, due to the compiler who united into a single poem the Telemachia, the Wanderings, the Return, and the Revenge of Odysseus. The speeches and actions of Telemachus in β are in strict conformity with the plans suggested by Athena in the previous book, so that these books cannot be independent. Do the speeches and actions follow as the result of the plan, or did they suggest it?

Belzner by a shrewd and convincing argument shows that book ii must have been composed under the influence of book i. In β 35 Telemachus stepped forward to speak and after speaking words of anger threw his scepter to the ground, yet remained standing. Achilles (A 245), after speaking in anger, threw his scepter to the ground, but, unlike Telemachus, he sat down. Why did Telemachus remain standing? Simply because he had not carried out the program suggested by Athena in the preceding book. When he had asked for the ships and spoken as the goddess advised he sat down. This phrase, β 224, $\omega\varsigma\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\omega\upsilon\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\tau'\ \acute{\alpha}\rho'\ \epsilon\zeta\epsilon\tau\omicron$, gives the cause for the delay, he had not yet obeyed Athena's instructions. The particle here cannot be explained without some previous narrative, such as given in α . The present order is therefore the original order of the first two books of the poem. This argument seems to me unanswerable.

The poet plans to develop a double suspense and a double danger in the adventures of the son and the father: each is to run his own risks until they unite in a common crisis in Ithaca. The first four books take up the story of

the son and close in tragic suspense, with the suitors determined to slay the prince and laying an ambush to await his return. The two, Telemachus and Odysseus, are alike under the care of Athena, the story of each begins under the same divine impulses, accordingly needs the same introduction, and therefore the poet cannot ignore the setting nor rely on a previous introduction when he takes up the story of Odysseus, but he must make a new start and repeat the introduction already used at the opening of book i. The opening conditions of the two tales are identical, hence the introduction to book v is not an imitation but a necessary restatement and the work of the same original poet. This, too, seems to me a most sensible and brilliant line of reasoning.

Belzner is very convincing in meeting the other arguments of the dis-sectors. Lack of space forbids further illustrations. Kirchhoff and Wilamowitz are taken too seriously, as time has shown the impossibility of their assumptions. It is no proof that Odysseus had never sported with the tangles in Calypso's hair because he does not dwell on that escapade when talking to Penelope, and I never could see how anyone could follow Kirchhoff in thinking that Odysseus must immediately have answered Arete's question and told his name. Had the hero done so he could have had no audience and no listeners, for who would follow an unknown wanderer in a narrative of 2,000 verses? The purpose of the poet was to withhold the name until the people were interested in the hero for his own sake. The games made them interested in him; the songs of Demodocus showed the interest they had in Odysseus; then when the poet shows that the athlete whom they have seen and the hero of whom they have heard are combined in Odysseus, the name could be given, but without keeping back the name no narrative of his wanderings is possible.

The familiar scholium which gives the information that Aristarchus and Aristophanes placed the end of the *Odyssey* at ψ 296, τοῦτο τέλος τῆς Ὀδυσσεΐας φησὶν Ἀρίσταρχος καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης, has been a stumbling-block in the way of admirers of Aristarchus who are also believers in the unity of the entire *Odyssey*.

Belzner gives a sane and convincing solution of the problem; the purpose of the *Odyssey* is the reunion of the husband and the wife, hence τέλος does not mean the end in the sense of *finis* or conclusion, but the end in the sense of goal or *Ziel*. When the purpose of the poem has been reached there yet remain the adjustment of parts and the conclusion; such adjustments and conclusion follow in book xxiv. Aristarchus has thus been wrongly quoted as an argument for the rejection of that book. When one considers how frequent the references to the aged father and his distress in the absence of the son he must admit that the poet could not have ignored Laertes when the son had returned. Belzner has done a real service for believers in Aristarchus and ω. In a work of such merit it seems ungracious to point out defects, but Dr. Belzner does not give himself time enough to study and ponder thoroughly; a book a year of such a nature is clearly too much, if wide scholarship and accuracy are to be considered. All work not done by Germans is unknown or ignored, no

article or book written outside of Germany is quoted or mentioned. This may be a matter of choice and so intentional, but p. 222 has an example of the grossest carelessness, I would hardly say ignorance: "Aber ganz ebenso vernehmen wir η 70 von φίλοι παῖδες des Alkinoos, nirgends aber tritt in der Dichtung jemand von ihnen ausser Nausikaa hervor, so dass es nach der Handlung des Epos so scheinen könnte, als sei sie das einzige Kind im phäakischen Königshaus." Nothing could be plainer than this statement that Homer names no sons of Alcinous, nothing except Homer himself: θ 118, ἀν δ' ἔσταν τρεῖς παῖδες ἀμύμονος Ἀλκινόοιο, Λαοδάμας θ' Ἀλῖός τε καὶ ἀντίθεος Κλυτόνηος. This is not an exceptional reference, as Laodamas is mentioned in the preceding book as giving his seat to Odysseus and as being the favorite son of Antinous, and he is one of the leading actors in this book, while Clytoneus is winner in the foot-race. The general excellence of Belzner's work shows that the haste with which it was written is the cause of this oversight.

The ready assumption of interpolations seems to me the greatest defect of the book. Dr. Leaf's recent work on Troy is a striking example of what first-hand knowledge can do for interpolated passages. When Dr. Leaf edited the *Iliad* he found interpolations everywhere, but when he studied the *Iliad* on the ground he restored practically every passage he had suspected before. It is an open question about there being an interpolated verse in Homer. If we are to follow Leaf in accepting the Trojan Catalogue and Belzner in accepting the introduction of the fifth book of the *Odyssey* as well as all references to the use of iron we can safely keep the rest hoping that added knowledge will clear up present difficulties.

This second volume in the series shows the same ability and originality as the first, but it has not been written with the same care and accuracy.

JOHN A. SCOTT

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

Campi Golfarii Romae Antiquae; Excerptum ex Actis Diurnis C. Cilni Maecenatis. Edited and Annotated by PAYSON SIBLEY WILD, M.A. Chicago: Brothers of the Book, 1912. 50 cents.

These *Fragments from the Diary of Maecenas* recently discovered by Dr. Ludwig von Aberwitz, of the University of Hofbräu, and now reposing in the W. K. Mendax Collection, add a new chapter to our knowledge of Roman life. The famous patron of literature is disclosed to us as the patron, if not indeed the father, of the "ancient and royal game." One or two scholars, it is true, have claimed an earlier origin for the game, but the evidence submitted is not convincing to Professor Aberwitz, whose judgment must be considered final in a question of this sort.

The "Notae" are very illuminating, and contain frequent citations from such unimpeachable authorities as Mentitus (*Commentaria Commenticia*) and

Plinius Tertius (*De Caudis Gallorum Martini*). An inscription reproduced from the *Libellus Epigraphicus* of Guglielmo Fakiro, and hitherto unexplained, is shown to be taken from a *tessera golfaria*.

Following the Latin text is a not too slavishly literal translation into English verse by Mr. Bert Leston Taylor whose classical scholarship and linguistic cleverness find a fitting field for their employment. The two or three vivid illustrations by Mr. F. Fox add to the attractiveness of the book. On the whole this little volume will prove a delight to the eye and a refreshment to the soul of the more human humanists into whose hands it may come.

W. L. CARR

Companion to Roman History. By H. STUART JONES. Oxford University Press, 1912. Pp. xii+472. 15s. net.

The introduction contains four sections, as follows: "Earliest Settlements of the Italians," "Development of the Town and Land System," "Development of Rome," "Roads and Sea Routes." Then follow chapters on "Architecture," "War," "Religion," "Production and Distribution," "Money," "Public Amusements," "Art." Three indices are added. There are abundant illustrations, well selected, and seven maps: "Italy in the Bronze Age," "Italy in the Iron Age," "Ancient Rome," "The Roman Empire" (its roads and sea routes), "The Roman Fora," "The Palatine," "The German *limes*."

In the first place it must be said that the topics treated are admirably handled. Mr. Jones's scholarship is accurate, his reading covers adequately the fields of which he writes, and his style is clear and straightforward. The bibliographies are not intended to be exhaustive, but are well selected. The arrangement is orderly, the chapters do not overlap, and one can easily lay his hand on information desired.

I find myself in doubt, however, as to just what field this book is to cover. Is it to supplement a fairly complete history of Rome? Or is it to complement the ordinary textbook? In either case it is hard to see why a section should be devoted to "Earliest Settlements of the Italians" (pp. 1 ff.) or to "Gladiatorial Shows" (pp. 360 ff.). Surely all histories give information on these subjects. Why should literature, education, law, the position of women, finance, the Roman calendar, etc., be entirely omitted and nearly one hundred and fifty pages given to architecture? If the book is intended for more general use than that indicated above, then these omissions are even harder to understand. Comparisons are necessarily unwelcome to one of the two authors involved, but I believe that Sandy's *Companion to Latin Studies*, with its wider range of information, will be more serviceable to most students of history.

The most important chapter in Mr. Jones's work is that on architecture. It has been carefully separated from art. Rome has suffered much by confusion here. Too many authors in their haste to decry Roman lack of taste in sculpture and Roman flamboyancy of architectural ornament have forgotten

Rome's magnificent contribution of new architectural forms and principles of construction. This Mr. Jones has not done and his summary of Roman architecture is significant.

The half-tone reproductions, so lavishly offered, are remarkably clear, but the gilt reproduction of the Lateran pilaster and of the sardonix portrait of Augustus disfigure rather than adorn the cover. The reader is also annoyed by frequent references to "figure" and "plate" by number and not by page.

L. E. LORD

OBERLIN COLLEGE

Recent Books

- BELOCH, K. J. *Griechische Geschichte*. 3. neugestaltete Aufl. 1. Bd. Die Zeit vor den Perserkriegen. 1. Abt. Strassburg: Trübner, 1912. Pp. xii+446. M. 8.50.
- BELZNER, E. *Homerische Probleme*. II, *Die Composition der Odyssee*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1912. Pp. viii+272. M. 8.
- BLASS-SUESS. *Bacchylidis Carmina cum Fragmentis*. Ed. Fr. Blass. Ed. IV., cur. Guilelm. Suess. Leipzig: Teubner, 1912. Pp. lxxxii+154. M. 2.80.
- BOTSFORD, GEORGE W., and LILLIE SHAW. *A Source-Book of Ancient History*. New York: Macmillan, 1912. Pp. x+594. \$1.30.
- FURNEAUX-PITMAN. *Tacitus, Annals*. Books v-xii. With Introduction and Notes, abridged from the larger work of Henry Furneaux by H. Pitman. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912. Pp. 274. 3s. 6d.
- LAUDIEN, A. *Griechische Inschriften als Illustrationen zu den Schulschriftstellern*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1912. Pp. 78. M. 1.60.
- MACGREGOR, J. M. *Plato, Ion*. With Introduction and Notes. Cambridge: University Press, 1912. (Pitt Press Series.) Pp. 70. 2s.
- STORR-BEST. *Varro. On Farming*. Translation, with Introduction, Commentary, and Excursus. London: Bell, 1912. Pp. xxxi+375. 5s.
- STUTTAFORD, C. *Catullus*. With Notes and Translation. London: Bell, 1912. 6s.
- THOMPSON, SIR EDWARD MAUNDE. *An Introduction to Greek and Latin Palaeography*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912. Pp. 616. 36s.
- VAN LEEUWEN, J. *Homeri Carmina. Cum prolegomenis, notis criticis, commentariis exegeticis. Ilias*. Leiden: Sijthoff, 1912. Pp. lxxv+450.
- WAY, A. S. *Virgil. The Georgics in English Verse*. London: Macmillan, 1912. Pp. 122. 2s. 6d.
- WETMORE, M. N. *Index Verborum Catallunus*. Yale University Press, 1913. Pp. 115. \$2.00.